

# EXHIBIT 5

Approved, SCAO

Original - Court  
1st copy - Defendant2nd copy - Plaintiff  
3rd copy - Return

<b>STATE OF MICHIGAN</b> JUDICIAL DISTRICT JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COUNTY PROBATE	<b>SUMMONS</b>	<b>CASE NO.</b> 20- <u>000225</u> - MZ <i>Stephens</i>
<b>Court address</b> Michigan Court of Claims, 925 W. Ottawa Street, Lansing, MI 48909		<b>Court telephone no.</b> 517-373-0807

Plaintiff's name(s), address(es), and telephone no(s).

Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., and  
Eric Ostergren

v

Defendant's name(s), address(es), and telephone no(s).

Jocelyn Benson, in her official capacity  
as Secretary of State  
430 W. Allegan St.  
Richard H. Austin Building, 4th Floor  
Lansing, MI 48918  
888-767-6424

Plaintiff's attorney, bar no., address, and telephone no.

Mark F. (Thor) Hearne, II, #P40231  
True North Law, LLC  
112 S. Hanley Road, Suite 200  
St. Louis, MO 63015 (314) 296-4000

**Instructions:** Check the items below that apply to you and provide any required information. Submit this form to the court clerk along with your complaint and, if necessary, a case inventory addendum (form MC 21). The summons section will be completed by the court clerk.

**Domestic Relations Case**

- ☐ There are no pending or resolved cases within the jurisdiction of the family division of the circuit court involving the family or family members of the person(s) who are the subject of the complaint.
- ☐ There is one or more pending or resolved cases within the jurisdiction of the family division of the circuit court involving the family or family members of the person(s) who are the subject of the complaint. I have separately filed a completed confidential case inventory (form MC 21) listing those cases.
- ☐ It is unknown if there are pending or resolved cases within the jurisdiction of the family division of the circuit court involving the family or family members of the person(s) who are the subject of the complaint.

**Civil Case**

- ☐ This is a business case in which all or part of the action includes a business or commercial dispute under MCL 600.8035.
- ☐ MDHHS and a contracted health plan may have a right to recover expenses in this case. I certify that notice and a copy of the complaint will be provided to MDHHS and (if applicable) the contracted health plan in accordance with MCL 400.106(4).
- ☒ There is no other pending or resolved civil action arising out of the same transaction or occurrence as alleged in the complaint.
- ☐ A civil action between these parties or other parties arising out of the transaction or occurrence alleged in the complaint has

been previously filed in ☐ this court, ☐ \_\_\_\_\_ Court, where

it was given case number \_\_\_\_\_ and assigned to Judge \_\_\_\_\_.

The action ☐ remains ☐ is no longer pending.

Summons section completed by court clerk.

**SUMMONS****NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANT:** In the name of the people of the State of Michigan you are notified:

1. You are being sued.
2. **YOU HAVE 21 DAYS** after receiving this summons and a copy of the complaint to **file a written answer with the court** and serve a copy on the other party **or take other lawful action with the court** (28 days if you were served by mail or you were served outside this state).
3. If you do not answer or take other action within the time allowed, judgment may be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
4. If you require special accommodations to use the court because of a disability or if you require a foreign language interpreter to help you fully participate in court proceedings, please contact the court immediately to make arrangements.

Issue date <u>11-4-2020</u>	Expiration date* <u>2-3-2021</u>	Court clerk <b>Jerome W. Zimmer Jr.</b>
--------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

\*This summons is invalid unless served on or before its expiration date. This document must be sealed by the seal of the court.

SUMMONS

Case No. 20-000225-MZ

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

TO PROCESS SERVER: You are to serve the summons and complaint not later than 91 days from the date of filing or the date of expiration on the order for second summons. You must make and file your return with the court clerk. If you are unable to complete service you must return this original and all copies to the court clerk.

**CERTIFICATE / AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE / NONSERVICE**☐ **OFFICER CERTIFICATE**

OR

☐ **AFFIDAVIT OF PROCESS SERVER**

I certify that I am a sheriff, deputy sheriff, bailiff, appointed court officer, or attorney for a party (MCR 2.104[A][2]), and that: (notarization not required)

Being first duly sworn, I state that I am a legally competent adult, and I am not a party or an officer of a corporate party (MCR 2.103[A]), and that: (notarization required)

☐ I served personally a copy of the summons and complaint,

☐ I served by registered or certified mail (copy of return receipt attached) a copy of the summons and complaint,

together with \_\_\_\_\_

List all documents served with the summons and complaint

\_\_\_\_\_ on the defendant(s):

Defendant's name	Complete address(es) of service	Day, date, time

☐ I have personally attempted to serve the summons and complaint, together with any attachments, on the following defendant(s) and have been unable to complete service.

Defendant's name	Complete address(es) of service	Day, date, time

I declare under the penalties of perjury that this proof of service has been examined by me and that its contents are true to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief.

Service fee	Miles traveled	Fee	
\$		\$	
Incorrect address fee	Miles traveled	Fee	TOTAL FEE
\$		\$	\$

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Name (type or print) \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

Subscribed and sworn to before me on \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ County, Michigan.  
Date

My commission expires: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date Deputy court clerk/Notary public

Notary public, State of Michigan, County of \_\_\_\_\_

**ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SERVICE**

I acknowledge that I have received service of the summons and complaint, together with \_\_\_\_\_ Attachments

\_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_  
Day, date, time

\_\_\_\_\_ on behalf of \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

**STATE OF MICHIGAN  
IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS**

DONALD J. TRUMP FOR PRESIDENT,  
INC, and  
ERIC OSTERGREN,

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 20- 000225 -MZ

v.

JOCELYN BENSON, in her official  
Capacity as SECRETARY OF STATE

Defendants.

---

**VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR IMMEDIATE DECLARATORY  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

---

There is no other pending or resolved civil  
action arising out of the transaction or  
occurrence alleged in the complaint.

**PARTIES**

**A. Plaintiffs Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., and Eric Ostergren**

1. Donald J. Trump for President, Inc. of the United States of America and is a candidate for reelection in the 2020 general election. Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., is the campaign committee for President Trump and Vice President Pence.

2. Eric Ostergren is a registered voter of Roscommon County, Michigan and credentialed and trained as an election "challenger." Eric Ostergren was excluded from the counting board during the absent voter ballot review process.

**B. Joselyn Benson is Michigan’s Secretary of State responsible for overseeing Oakland County’s conduct of the 2020 presidential election.**

3. Jocelyn Benson is Michigan’s Secretary of State and is the “chief elections officer” responsible for overseeing the conduct of Michigan elections. MCL 168.21 (“The secretary of state shall be the chief election officer of the state and shall have supervisory control over local election officials in the performance of their duties under the provisions of this act.”); 168.31(1)(a) (the “Secretary of State shall ... issue instructions and promulgate rules ... for the conduct of elections and registrations in accordance with the laws of this state”). Local election officials must follow Secretary Benson’s instructions regarding the conduct of elections. Michigan law provides that Secretary Benson “[a]dvise and direct local election officials as to the proper methods of conducting elections.” MCL 168.31(1)(b). *See also Hare v. Berrien Co Bd. of Election*, 129 N.W.2d 864 (Mich. 1964); *Davis v. Sec’y of State*, 2020 Mich. App. LEXIS 6128, at \*9 (Mich. Ct. App. Sep. 16, 2020).

4. Secretary Benson is responsible for assuring Michigan’s local election officials conduct elections in a fair, just, and lawful manner. *See* MCL 168.21; 168.31; 168.32. *See also League of Women Voters of Michigan v. Secretary of State*, 2020 Mich. App. LEXIS 709, \*3 (Mich. Ct. App. Jan. 27, 2020); *Citizens Protecting Michigan's Constitution v. Secretary of State*, 922 N.W.2d 404 (Mich. Ct. App. 2018), *aff’d* 921 N.W.2d 247 (Mich. 2018); *Fitzpatrick v. Secretary of State*, 440 N.W.2d 45 (Mich. Ct. App. 1989).

### **JURISDICTION AND STANDING**

5. The Court of Claims has “exclusive” jurisdiction to “hear and determine any claim or demand, statutory or constitutional,” or any demand for “equitable[ ] or declaratory relief or any demand for an extraordinary writ against the state or any of its departments or officers



notwithstanding another law that confers jurisdiction of the cast in the circuit court.” MCL 600.6419(1)(a).

6. Donald J. Trump has a special and substantial interest in assuring that Michigan processes the ballots of Michigan citizens case according to Michigan law so that every lawful Michigan voter’s ballot is fairly and equally processed and counted. Eric Ostergren has a special and substantial interest under Michigan law as a credentialed election challenger to observe the processing of absent voter ballots.

7. Plaintiffs raise statutory and constitutional claims asking this Court to order equitable, declaratory, and extraordinary relief against Secretary of State Benson. This Court has exclusive jurisdiction to hear these claims. Venue is appropriate in this Court.

8. An actual controversy exists between Plaintiffs and Secretary of State Benson. Plaintiffs has suffered, or will suffer, an irreparable constitutional injury should Secretary Benson continue to fail to ensure that Michigan complies with Michigan law allowing challengers to meaningfully monitor the conduct of the election.

### **BACKGROUND**

9. A general election is being held in the State of Michigan on November 3, 2020.

10. MCL 168.765a, regarding Absent Voter Counting Boards, where absentee votes are processed and counted, states in relevant part as follows:

At all times, at least 1 election inspector from each major political party must be present at the absent voter counting place and the policies and procedures adopted by the secretary of state regarding the counting of absent voter ballots must be followed.

11. Michigan absent voter counting boards are not complying with this statute. These boards are being conducted without inspectors from each party being present.

12. Further, a political party, incorporated organization, or organized committee of interested citizens may designate one “challenger” to serve at each counting board. MCL 168.730.

13. An election challenger’s appointed under MCL 168.730 has those responsibilities described at MCL 168.733.

14. An election challenger's legal rights are as follows:

- a. An election challenger shall be provided a space within a polling place where they can observe the election procedure and each person applying to vote. MCL 168.733(1).
- b. An election challenger must be allowed opportunity to inspect poll books as ballots are issued to electors and witness the electors' names being entered in the poll book. MCL 168.733(1)(a).
- c. An election Challenger must be allowed to observe the manner in which the duties of the election inspectors are being performed. MCL 168.733(1)(b).
- d. An election challenger is authorized to challenge the voting rights of a person who the challenger has good reason to believe is not a registered elector. MCL 168.733(1)(c).
- e. An election challenger is authorized to challenge an election procedure that is not being properly performed. MCL 168.733(1)(d).
- f. An election challenger may bring to an election inspector’s attention any of the following: (1) improper handling of a ballot by an elector or election inspector; (2) a violation of a regulation made by the board of election inspectors with regard to the time in which an elector may remain in the polling place; (3) campaigning and fundraising being performed by an election inspector or other person covered by MCL 168.744; and/or (4) any other violation of election law or other prescribed election procedure. MCL 168.733(1)(e).
- g. An election challenger may remain present during the canvass of votes and until the statement of returns is duly signed and made. MCL 168.733(1)(f).
- h. An election challenger may examine each ballot as it is being counted. MCL 168.733(1)(g).
- i. An election challenger may keep records of votes cast and other election procedures as the challenger desires. MCL 168.733(1)(h).

- j. An election challenger may observe the recording of absent voter ballots on voting machines. MCL 168.733(1)(i).

15. Michigan values the important role challengers perform in assuring the transparency and integrity of elections. For example, Michigan law provides it is a felony punishable by up to two years in state prison for any person to threaten or intimidate a challenger who is performing any activity described in Michigan law. MCL 168.734(4); MCL 168.734. It is a felony punishable by up to two years in state prison for any person to prevent the presence of a challenger exercising their rights or to fail to provide a challenger with “conveniences for the performance of the[ir] duties.” MCL 168.734.

16. Local election jurisdictions locate ballot drop-off boxes without opportunity for challengers to observe the process, and as such Secretary Benson violates her constitutional and statutory authority and damages the integrity of Michigan elections.

17. Michigan law requires that ballot containers be monitored by video surveillance. See Senate Bill 757 at 761d(4)(c).

18. Secretary Benson is violating the Michigan Constitution and Michigan election law by allowing absent voter ballots to be processed and counted without allowing challengers to observe the video of the ballot boxes into which these ballots are placed.

19. Plaintiffs asks Secretary Benson to segregate ballots cast in these remote and unattended ballot drop boxes and, before the ballots are processed, removed from their verifying envelopes, and counted, allow designated challengers to view the video of the remote ballot box.

20. Secretary Benson’s actions and her failure to act have undermined the constitutional right of all Michigan voters – including the voters bringing this action – to participate in fair and lawful elections. These Michigan citizens’ constitutional rights are being violated by Secretary



Benson's failure to prevent unlawful ballots to be processed and her failure to ensure that statutorily-authorized challengers have a right to do their job.

## COUNT I

### **Secretary Benson violated the Equal Protection Clause of Michigan's Constitution**

21. Michigan's Constitution declares that "[n]o person shall be denied the equal protection of the laws ...." Const 1963, art 1, § 2.

22. This clause is coextensive with the United States Constitution's Equal Protection Clause. *Harville v. State Plumbing & Heating* 218 Mich. App. 302, 305-306; 553 N.W.2d 377 (1996). *See also Bush v. Gore*, 531 U.S. 98, 104 (2000) ("Having once granted the right to vote on equal terms, the State may not, by later arbitrary and disparate treatment, value one person's vote over that of another."); *Harper v. Virginia Bd. of Elections*, 383 U.S. 663, 665, (1966) ("Once the franchise is granted to the electorate, lines may not be drawn which are inconsistent with the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.")<sup>1</sup>

23. Plaintiff seeks declaratory and injunctive relief requiring Secretary Benson to direct that election authorities comply with Michigan law mandating election inspectors from each party and allowing challengers access to video of ballot boxes before counting of relevant votes takes place.

---

<sup>1</sup> Most United States Supreme Court rulings concerning the right to vote frame the issue in terms of the Equal Protection Clause. Ronald D. Rotunda & John E. Nowak, *Treatise on Constitutional Law: Substance & Procedure* §18.31(a) (2012 & Supp. 2015).

## COUNT II

### **Secretary Benson and Oakland County violated Michigan voters' rights under the Michigan Constitution's "purity of elections" clause.**

24. The Michigan Constitution's "purity of elections" clause states, "the legislature shall enact laws to regulate the time, place and manner of all nominations and elections, to preserve the purity of elections, to preserve the secrecy of the ballot, to guard against abuses of the elective franchise, and to provide for a system of voter registration and absentee voting." Const. 1963, art 2, §4(2).

25. "The phrase 'purity of elections' does not have a single precise meaning. But it unmistakably requires fairness and evenhandedness in the election laws of this state." *Barrow v. Detroit Election Comm.*, 854 N.W.2d 489, 504 (Mich. Ct. App. 2014).

26. Michigan statutes protect the purity of elections by allowing ballot challengers and election inspectors to monitor absentee ballots at counting boards.

27. Plaintiff seeks declaratory and injunctive relief requiring Secretary Benson to direct that election authorities comply with Michigan law mandating election inspectors from each party and allowing challengers access to video of ballot boxes before counting of relevant votes takes place.

## COUNT III

### **The Secretary of State is Violating of MCL 168.765a.**

28. MCL 168.765a, regarding Absent Voter Counting Boards, where absentee votes are processed and counted, states in relevant part as follows:

At all times, at least 1 election inspector from each major political party must be present at the absent voter counting place and the policies and procedures adopted by the secretary of state regarding the counting of absent voter ballots must be followed.

29. Michigan absent voter counting boards, under the authority of Secretary Benson, are not complying with this statute. These boards are being conducted without inspectors from each party being present.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

These Michigan citizens and voters ask this Court to:

- A. Order “a speedy hearing” of this action and “advance it on the calendar” as provided by MCR 2.605(D);
- B. Mandate that Secretary Benson order all counting and processing of absentee votes cease immediately until an election inspector from each party is present at each absent voter counting board and until video is made available to challengers of each ballot box;
- C. Mandate that Secretary Benson order the immediate segregation of all ballots that are not being inspected and monitored as aforesaid and as is required under law.
- D. Award these Michigan citizens the costs, expenses, and expert witness fees they incurred in this action as allowed by law.

Dated: November 4, 2020


Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark F. (Thor) Hearne, II  
MARK F. (THOR) HEARNE, II  
#P40231  
STEPHEN S. DAVIS  
J. MATTHEW BELZ  
TRUE NORTH LAW, LLC  
112 S. Hanley Road, Suite 200  
St. Louis, MO 63105  
(314) 296-4000  
thor@truenorthlawgroup.com

VERIFICATION

STATE OF MICHIGAN            )  
  ) ss  
COUNTY OF OAKLAND        )

I, Eric Ostergren being first duly sworn, depose and say that I am a resident of the state of Michigan and duly qualified as a voter in this state. While I may not have personal knowledge of all of the facts recited in this Complaint, the information contained therein has been collected and made available to me by others, and I declare, pursuant to MCR 2.114(B)(2), that the allegations contained in this Complaint are true to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief.

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 4<sup>th</sup> day of <sup>November</sup> ~~October~~, 2020.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public

Midland County, Michigan

My Commission Expires: 11-22-2023

Acting in Midland County, Michigan

